

Appl. No. 10/601,005

Attorney Docket No. 81751.0061

Amdt. Dated \_\_\_\_\_

Customer No.: 26021

Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2008

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 14 2008

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 18 are proposed to be amended as shown above.

A. Claim 1 is amended to clarify the instruction codes are fetched and stored in the instruction queue (see the attached proposal), in order to overcome the rejections in paragraph 7a and 7b. on page 3, lines 8 to 18 of the Office Action.

B. Claim 1 is amended to also clarify "based on" modifies "read out," an "instruction code" is read out from a memory and a "fetch circuit" fetches an "instruction code" in the instruction queue, in order to overcome the rejection in paragraph 7.c. on page 3, line 19 to page 4, line 4 of the Office Action.

C. Regarding the rejection in paragraph 7.d. on page 4, lines 5 to 7 of the Office Action, it appears that the Office Action misunderstands the present invention. To clarify, Applicant points out that the branch setting instruction expressly or implicitly covers the information concerning the branch occurring address 314, 414 and the information concerning the branch target address 316, 416, as illustrated in Figs. 3B and 5B. Moreover, the branch occurs when the fetch address matches with the branch occurring address. In other words, unlike the statement made in the Office Actions, the branch occurring address is neither the address in the memory where the branch instruction is stored, nor the (branch) target address that is encoded in a branch (setting) instruction. The branch occurring address is for instance address P1 in Fig. 3C where the branch occurs. In view of this feature Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 2 clearly specify that the branch occurring address is an address where the branch occurs, by "a branch to the branch target address occurring when the fetch address is the branch occurring address after a x-th instruction from the branch setting instruction."

Appl. No. 10/601,005

Attorney Docket No. 81751.0061

Amdt. Dated \_\_\_\_\_

Customer No.: 26021

Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2008

Claim 2 is amended as shown based on the same rationals as A-C above in order to overcome the rejection in paragraph 7.e. on page 4, line 8 of the Office Action.

D. Claims 3 to 18 are amended to clarify the claims and to overcome the rejection in paragraph 8.a. on page 4, lines 9 to 14 of the Office Action.